

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03402 01 OF 02 241526Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 /088 W

----- 027231

O P 241405Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2416

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3402

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: JUNE 23 MEETING OF REINFORCED SPC ON OPTION III

REF: A. USVIEWS PAPER; B. STATE 135536; C. STATE 146646;

D. STATE 108800; E. USNATO 3397 DTG 231900Z

SUMMARY: FIRST DAY OF REINFORCED SPC MEETING INVOLVED SEVERAL PRESENTATIONS OF GENERAL VIEWS, AND A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS WHICH U.S. REPS ANSWERED BY REFERENCE TO REFS A, B AND C. DISCUSSION WAS AMICABLE AND MEETING ADJOURNED HALF HOUR EARLY BECAUSE OTHER DELGATIONS RAN OUT OF QUESTIONS. THE SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS INDICATED THAT THE U.S. HAS A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF WORK TO DO BEFORE ALLIANCE AGREEMENT CAN BE REACHED. IT ALSO APPEARS THAT ALLIES WILL INSIST ON REACHING AGREEMENT ON SOME MATTERS OTHER THAN THOSE APPROPRIATE FOR AHG PRESENTATION TO EAST. THIS MESSAGE SURVEYS INITIAL IMPRESSIONS OF ALLIED ATTITUDES, AND
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03402 01 OF 02 241526Z

THEN REPORTS DISCUSSION UNDER THE HEADINGS OF THE FIVE TOPICS IN WHICH IT TOOK PLACE. NEXT SPC MEETING ON THIS SUBJECT WILL BE 9:30 A.M. JUNE 24. NO GUIDANCE NEEDED AT PRESENT. END SUMMARY

1. NATIONAL VIEWS. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SPOKE ON AN UNIN-
STRUCTURED BASIS, AND EXPRESSED NUMEROUS DIFFERENCES OF APPROACH
FROM U.S. PAPER. HE WOULD PREFER TO DROP F-4 AIRCRAFT FROM
OPTION III, ELIMINATE ALL EQUIPMENT CEILINGS, AND MAKE GROUND
FORCE COMMON CEILING ATTAINABLE INSTEAD BY AGREEING TO SUB-
STANTIAL AIR FORCE OVERHANG. AS FALLBACK HE WOULD FIRST PLAY
OPTION III, AND ONLY THEREAFTER INCLUDE AIR IN COMMON CEILING.
CANADIAN REP (ROY) PRESENTED A LARGE NUMBER OF QUESTIONS SUGGEST-
ING A VERY CAREFUL CANADIAN READING OF THE U.S. PAPER. NO
DIVERGENCE OF PRINCIPLE APPEARED. DANISH REP (VILLADSEN) SAID
NOTHING OF SUBSTANCE. FRG REP (BOSS) PRESENTED LENGTHY POSITION
STATEMENT WHICH AFTER NEW INTRODUCTORY SECTION WAS SIMILAR TO
REF D. THEREAFTER HE CONFINED HIMSELF TO BRIEF INTERVENTIONS
REITERATING SOME OF THESE POINTS. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI)
SPOKE OF MANY PROBLEMS REQUIRING LONG STUDY, AND WAS ONLY OPPONENT
OF PRESENTING OPTION III AS A SINGLE PACKAGE. LUXEMBOURG REP
(HOSTERT) SPOKE TWICE ON BROAD ISSUES. NETHERLANDS REP (BUWALDA)
SUPPORTED MOST U.S. POINTS, AND SEEMED RECEPTIVE TO U.S.
ARGUMENTS AGAINST TASKING APPROACH TO AIRCRAFT CEILINGS. UK
REP (LOGAN) SPOKE MODERATELY, BUT PRESSED FOR AGREEMENT ON
COMMON CEILING MORE SPECIFIC THAN "CONCEPT." NORWEGIAN, GREEK,
AND TURKISH DELEGATES DID NOT SPEAK. ICELAND REPRESENTATIVE
DID NOT ATTEND WHILE PORTUGUESE REP (MACEDO) ATTENDED MORNING
SESSION ONLY AND DID NOT SPEAK OR TAKE NOTES.

2. CONTENT. BELIGAN REP RAISED QUESTION OF THE RATIONALE FOR
THE NUMBERS 54 (F-4) AND 36 (PERSHING), AND APPEARED SATISFIED
BY RESPONSE THAT THEY REPRESENTED NOMINAL UNIT SIZES AT THE TIME
THE OPTION WAS DRAWN UP. HE FURTHER QUESTIONED DESIRABILITY OF
INCLUDING F-4 AIRCRAFT AT ALL, SINCE HE FELT THAT IT WOULD LEAD
TO RESTRAINTS ON ALLIED AIRCRAFT. HE RECEIVED NO SUPPORT ON THIS
POINT. CANADIAN REP AND BELGIAN REP BOTH QUESTIONED WHETHER
OFFER AS FORMULATED WOULD BE SUFFICIENTLY ATTRACTIVE TO SOVIETS.
NETHERLANDS AND BELGIAN REPS ASKED HOW SOON WITHDRAWN F-4S COULD
RETURN, AND WERE TOLD THAT THIS HAD NOT BEEN DECIDED. IN
GENERAL, SPC DID NOT QUESTION U.S. ASSERTIONS THAT PACKAGE WAS
A SUBSTANTIAL ONE, BUT MILITARILY ACCEPTABLE TO NATO. ALL WILL
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03402 01 OF 02 241526Z

RESERVE JUDGMENT ON LATTER POINT UNTIL UPDATED SHAPE REPORT
IS RECEIVED AT BEGINNING OF JULY. CANADIAN REP POINTED OUT
THAT THERE WOULD BE A PROBLEM IN SIMULTANEOUSLY CONVINCING THE
SOVIETS THAT THE OFFER WAS SIGNIFICANT, AND CONVINCING ALLIED
PUBLIC OPINION THAT ALLIES HAD NOT SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED
DETERRENT. U.S. REPS SAID THEY THOUGHT THIS COULD BE DEALT WITH
IN U.S. ALTHOUGH IT MIGHT BE A EUROPEAN PROBLEM. ITALIAN
REP ECHOED FRG POINT THAT DETERRENCE IS PSYCHOLOGICAL AS WELL
AS MILITARY, AND EXPRESSED CONCERN THAT NUCLEAR REDUCTIONS
MIGHT ERODE IT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03402 02 OF 02 241540Z

46

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00

USIE-00 INRE-00 NRC-05 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07

IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01

SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 /088 W

----- 027499

O P 241405Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2417

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3402

3. OBJECTIVES. UK AND FRG REPS BOTH MADE STRONG POINT THAT IT WOULD NOT BE ENOUGH TO SEEK COMMON CEILING "CONCEPT," THOUGH THEY STOPPED SHORT OF INSISTING THAT NOTHING LESS THAN AN AGREED NUMERICAL LEVEL WOULD DO. U.S. REP ARGUED AGAINST NUMERICAL SEPCIFICATION ON GROUNDS THAT IT WOULD INVOLVE ALLIES IN NEGOTIATION OF PHASE II ISSUES. UK REP ARGUED SEVERAL TIMES THAT SINCE ALLIES HAVE NO AMMUNITION FOR PHASE II COMPARABLE TO OPTION III, THE DIFFICULT PART OF THE NEGOTIATIONS MUST BE COMPLETED IN PHASE I. BELGIAN, NETHERLANDS, CANADIAN, AND ITALIAN REPS ECHOED UK AND FRG ASSERTION THAT COMMON CEILING IS PRIMARY ALLIED GOAL, AND BELGIAN REP SUGGESTED THAT IN DRAFTING AHG GUIDANCE THE COMMON CIELING BE MENTIOED FIRST. U.S. REP ARGUED STRONGLY THAT THE TWO OBJECTIVES SHOULD BE VIEWED AS AN INTEGRATED WHOLE, AND THAT WE SHOULD NOT DENIGRATE TANK ARMY OBJECTIVE IN EASTERN EYES BY INDICATING COMMON CEILING HAD HIGHER PRIORITY. GROUP APPEARED TO AGREE, BUT NEVERTHELESS FELT THAT COMMON CIELING WAS "MORE EQUAL." ITALIAN REP POINTED OUT THAT COMMON CEILING MUST INCLUDE RECOGNITION THAT THERE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03402 02 OF 02 241540Z

WOULD BE NO NATIONAL SUBCEILINGS, AND MANY AGREED.

4. GLOBAL OFFER OR SERIATIM. BELGIUM, FRG, CANADA, THE NETHERLANDS, AND UK ALL SUPPORTED PRESENTATION OF OPTION III TO THE EAST AS A GLOBAL PACKAGE, RATHER THAN SERIATIM. UK REP STRESSED IMPORTANCE OF GLOBAL APPROACH FROM EUROPEAN POINT OF VIEW, IN

ORDER TO GET ACROSS TO EAST THE IDEA THAT THIS WAS "ONCE AND FOR ALL" PACKAGE. ONLY ITALY FAVORED SERIATIM APPROACH, ON GROUNDS THAT ALLIES SOULD LET OTHER SIDE KNOW THAT THEY WOULD NOT PUT FORWARD FURTHER ELEMENTS OF OPTION III UNTIL EAST MADE STEPS TOWARD OUR OBJECTIVES. (COMMENT: WE DO NOT EXPECT ITALY WILL PERSIST IN THIS POSITION IN VIEW OF HER COMPLETE ISOLATION.)

5. CEILINGS. UK REP STRESSED NEED FOR FULL ALLIANCE EXAMINATION, IN VIEW OF IMPORTANCE OF PROTECTING ALLIED EQUIPMENT PROGRAM. BELGIAN REP STRESSED DANGER OF IMPLICIT CEILINGS ON ALLIES ARISING FROM CEILINGS ON U.W. EQUIPMENT. HE ADVOCATED STRICT ALLIED ADHERENCE TO POSITION THAT ARMAMENTS WILL BE LIMITED ONLY BY LIMITS ON MANPOWER, AT LEAST UNTIL EAST HAS AGREED TO COMMON CEILING. ANY LIMITS ON U.S. AND SOVIET EQUIPMENT SHOULD BE ADDED ONLY AFTER ALLIES HAD ACHIEVED THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THEIR POSITION AND ONLY IF ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY. U.S. REPS POINTED OUT NEED TO DEFER DISCUSSIONS OF CEILINGS, BUT ALSO THAT ALLIES HAD TO CONVEY IDEA OF MEANINGFUL OFFER TO EAST, AND HAD TO PRECLUDE EASTERN CLAIMS THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, ALL HIGH PERFORMANCE AIRCRAFT WERE LIMITED. UK REP POINTED OUT ALLIED NEED TO PREVENT EAST FROM RETURNING WITHDRAWN TANKS TO NGA. RE DUTCH EXPRESSION OF INTEREST IN TASKING DEFINITION FOR AIRCRAFT, U.S. RESP DREW ON GREATER PART OF TEXT ON AIR-CRAFT DEFINITION IN REF C AT AFTERNOON SESSION IN ABSENCE OF PORTUGUESE.

6. AIR MANPOWER. BELGIUM WAS ONLY DELEGATION TO OPPOSE THE CONCEPT OF INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN COMMON CEILING, ON GROUNDS THAT IT WOULD BOTH DEPRIVE THE EAST OF BENEFIT OF RE-DEFINITION OF GROUND FORCES, AND ADD TO EASTERN REDUCTIONS, THUS INCREASING ALLIED PHASE I DEMANDS ON THE EAST. IN ADDITION, OTHER SIDE HAS NOT ASKED FOR INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN COMMON CEILING. U.S. REPS STRESSED THAT SOVIETS WANT AIR MANPOWER COVERED. ALLIES HAVE ALREADY TOLD EAST AIR MANPOWER WOULD BE COVERED IN SOME WAY IN PHASE II, AND WOULD NOW ONLY TELL THE SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03402 02 OF 02 241540Z

EAST HOW IT WOULD BE COVERED. ALLIES COULD USE AGGREGATE GROUND/AIR COMMON CEILING AGAINST EASTERN ARGUMENTS THAT ALLIES WANTED TO LEAVE THEMSELVES FREE FOR ARMS RACE. IT WAS NOT CERTAIN THIS U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD INCREASE DISPARITIES, IN VIEW OF EASTERN REFUSAL THUS FAR TO EXCHANGE DATA.

7. TIMING. THE ONLY NEW POINT ON THE TIMING OF PRESENTATION OF OPTION III TO THE OTHER SIDE WAS THE REMARK BY FRG REP THAT FRG ASSUMES THAT THIS WILL NOT BE BEFORE CONCLUSION OF CSCE, OR BEFORE "PROBLEMS REGARDING SALT II ARE SETTLED".

8. SPC MEETING RESUMES 0930 JUNE 24. BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 24 JUN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GarlanWA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03402
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750698/abbrzkrm.tel
Line Count: 216
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. USVIEWS PAPER; B. STATE 135536; C. STATE 146646; D. STATE 108800; E. USNATO 3397 DTG 231900Z
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GarlanWA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <24 JUL 2003 by GarlanWA>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: JUNE 23 MEETING OF REINFORCED SPC ON OPTION III
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006